

REMARKS

A substantively similar Amendment and Response were originally submitted within a two-month period of time in which to response. However, no advisory action or any other communication was thereafter received Subsequent follow up on PAIR and through Examiners (both primary examining and supervisory) had indicated that the Application was allowed. Ultimately, Applicants discovered the application was unintentionally abandoned. Hence, this Amendment and Response is resubmitted with a Petition for Revival of An Application for Patent Abandoned Unintentionally Under 27 CFR 1.137(b), Declarations, and fee for the Office. Reinstatement and allowance of the Application is now requested.

Prior to the final Office Action dated February 10, 2006, claims 1-8, 10-19, 21, 23-45, 48, 51-52, 55-62, 64, 67-71, 73-81, 83, 87-110, 112-119, 121-130, and 134-170 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In the final Office Action dated February 10, 2006, claims 1-8, 10-19, 21, 23-41, 44-45, 47-48, 51-52, 55-62, 64, 67-71, 73-81, 83, 87-110, 112-119, 121-129, and 134-170 were allowed, and claims 42-43 and 130 were rejected. Applicant thanks Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Applicant is cancelling claims 42, 43, and 130. No claims are amended and no claims are added with this Amendment and Response. In making these changes, Applicant has not and does not narrow the scope of the protection to which Applicant considers the claimed invention to be entitled and does not concede that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicant reserves the right to pursue

such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

In the final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 42-43 and 130 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,072,537 (“Gurner”). Although Applicant believes that these claims predate the Gurner reference, e.g. at page 8, line 5, through page 9, line 1, and page 5, line 14 through 33, of the parent application, Applicant is cancelling them in order to expedite prosecution of this reissue application. Hence, the basis for the rejection of these claims has been obviated.

With the rejected claims now cancelled, only the allowed claims remain in this application. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance at this time.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites Examiner to contact Applicant’s representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
DAVID GREEN

Date: March 23, 2007

By: /Rajiv P. Patel/

Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,327
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200